

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of an Office Action dated May 21, 2004. In this response Applicants have amended claim 11 and added claim 28. Support for these amendments may be found in the specification, *inter alia*, in Page 9, lines 11-15 and Figure 4. Following entry of these amendments, claims 1 and 3-28 are pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks which follow.

Rejections Under § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 1, 3-12, 15-21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,841,360 to Binder in view of U.S. Patent 5,615,344 to Corder.

In addition, on page 3 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Binder in view of Corder and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,698,992 to El Ayat et al. (hereinafter "El Ayat").

Finally, on page 4 of the Office Action, the PTO has rejected claims 22-23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Binder in view of Corder and in further view of U.S. Patent 6,225,769 to Brenner et al. (hereinafter "Brenner").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). See MPEP §2143.03. Here, neither Binder, Corder, El Ayat nor Brenner, taken either individually or in combination, teach or properly suggest "overwritably storing a subscriber number" in a programmable memory as recited in independent claim 1.

In Binder, the PSICs can have their addresses determined "on-the-fly" by the PSICs, based on their locations in a network topology (see column 7, lines 1-20), or they can be "manually" set by way of a DIP switch or by a unique address code stored in ROM (see column 7, lines 38-43). Binder does not contemplate overwritably storing a subscriber number in a programmable memory, since he only discloses a Read-Only-Memory (ROM).

The PTO, however, relies on Corder to disclose the use of an EEPROM instead of a ROM. Corder is directed to interfaces for peripheral devices to be connected to a computer,

and the need to reduce the number of types of interfacing devices needed. See column 2, lines 5-12 of Corder. Corder utilizes a smart cable 28 for providing control of a peripheral device 22 connected to a computer 24 (via a PCMCIA card 26), wherein the smart cable includes a PROM 32 and a PROM 34. The PROM 32 includes configuration information that defines the bus interface, defines address decoding, provides the types of accessible cycles, provides the protocol for connection to the peripheral device interface circuit 36, and provides the logic for accomplishing these functions. Upon power up, information is accessed from the PROM 32 to cause the gates in the PGA circuit to reconfigure according to that information. See column 5, lines 17-33 of Corder.

The PROM 34 contains card information structure (CIS) information that is used by the host computer 24 to interact with the peripheral device 22. Such information includes the type of peripheral device, address mapping, interrupt capability, how to program any programmable memory, and access time information. See column 5, lines 34-43 of Corder.

As explained in column 7, lines 28-35 of Corder, his reconfigurable adapter card 26 can be utilized for any type of peripheral device (either 22 of Figure 5A or 22' of Figure 5B), whereby a device-specific smart cable is used for each particular peripheral device. The information provided in the respective PROMS 32 and 34 appears to be information related to operation of the respective peripheral device that is connected to the computer by way of the smart cable 28, and not related to address information for accessing the respective peripheral device. This is because, in Corder, the PCMCIA card connection from the computer to the peripheral device is via a particular I/O port (PCMCIA socket, as described in column 6, lines 15-16) of the computer, and thus all data sent to/from that I/O port (by way of the PCMCIA card and smart cable) is of course from the peripheral device connected (indirectly) to that particular I/O port of the computer. The "address mapping" mentioned in column 5, line 36 of Corder relates to information provided to the host computer so that the host computer can access a particular memory region within the peripheral device, and it is not related to accessing another peripheral device (which would presumably be connected to a different I/O port of the computer).

Thus, at best, the combined teachings of Corder and Binder would result in a programmable memory provided in Binder's PSIC for the purpose of writing data to a particular memory region of a device or causing an interrupt for the device (e.g., sensor or

actuator) coupled to that PSIC, for example, whereby the programmable memory would not be utilized to store a new subscriber number for the PSIC (since that is not the reason why a programmable memory is utilized in the system of Corder).

Accordingly, neither Binder nor Corder, taken either individually or in combination, teach or properly suggest an “overwritably storing a subscriber number” in a programmable memory as recited in independent claim 1. El Ayat and Brenner, taken either individually or together with Binder and Corder, add nothing to resolve the deficiencies of the combined teachings of Binder and Corder.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). See MPEP 2143.03. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3-27, which ultimately depend from claim 1, are also non-obvious.

With respect to claims 11 and 12, Applicants note that those claims recite two mutually associated connector parts for connecting the circuit to the cable, wherein a subscriber number can be set by means of at least one of the connector parts. This feature is best seen in Figure 4 of the drawings, for example, and provides a different way of providing a new address code for the electrical circuit. The Office Action refers to column 7 of Binder for allegedly disclosing the features recited in claims 11 and 12, but this assertion is incorrect. Column 7, lines 41-44 of Binder discloses the use of a DIP (dual-inline package) switch as a hardware component for setting a unique address code for a PSIC. However, a DIP switch does not correspond to two mutually associated connector parts for connecting a circuit to a cable, as recited in claim 11. Also, claim 12 recites that each of the two connector parts has a plurality of connector contacts that are selectively connectable to a conductor in the cable, where again a DIP switch does not meet these claim features. Note that the two connector parts as recited in claims 11 and 12 are hardware components utilized to set the subscriber number via software.

Further, Applicants note that claim 11 has been amended to recite an apparatus wherein the “subscriber number can be set by means of at least one of said connector parts via software coding by way of data provided from a data line connected to one of the connector parts,” and none of the cited references, taken either individually or in combination, teach or suggest this feature of the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claim 1.

Newly Added Claim 28

In this response, Applicants have added claim 28. Applicants note that none of the cited references, taken either individually or in combination, teach or suggest an apparatus wherein the plurality of connector contacts are connected to a single data line, in which a particular disposition of data bits in time sequence are respectively received by the plurality of connector contacts such that each one of the connector contacts retrieves a particular one of the data bits in accordance with the particular disposition, so as to receive a new subscriber number provided to the electrical circuit by way of software coding.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. An early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/21/04

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5414

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

Richard L. Schwaab

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 25,479

Paul D. Strain

Agent for Applicants

Registration No. 47,369

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.